1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 9 10 GEORGE SLOAN, CASE NO. 2:23-cv-00124-RAJ-GJL Petitioner, 11 v. ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO 12 SUBSTITUTE RESPONDENT DEAN MASON, 13 Respondent. 14 15 This is a federal habeas action filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Before the Court is 16 Interested Party Attorney General's Motion to Substitute Respondent. Dkt. 33. In the Motion, the 17 Attorney General informs the Court that, since Petitioner is now in the custody of the 18 Washington Department of Corrections ("DOC") and is housed at the Washington Corrections 19 Center ("WCC"), the proper respondent in this matter is Dean Mason, the Superintendent of 20 WCC. *Id.* Thus, the Attorney General requests the Court substitute the proper respondent—Dean 21 Mason, Superintendent of WCC—in this matter. *Id.* Upon review, the Court agrees 22 Superintendent Mason is the proper Respondent and grants the Motion. 23 24

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE RESPONDENT - 1

The proper respondent to a habeas petition is the "person who has custody over [the petitioner]." 28 U.S.C. § 2242; see also § 2243; Brittingham v. United States, 982 F.2d 378 (9th Cir. 1992); Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989). At the time Petitioner filed his Petition, he was being held in the King County Jail as a pretrial detainee. See Dkt. 1. However, as the Attorney General indicates, Petitioner has now been transferred to the Washington DOC to serve the sentence imposed for his King County convictions. Dkt. 33 at 2. As such, Dean Mason, the Superintendent of WCC where Petitioner is currently housed, is the proper Respondent in this matter. See Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426, 435 (2004) (the person having custody of the person detained for purposes of § 2254 is typically the warden of the facility where the petitioner is incarcerated).

The Motion to Substitute Respondent (Dkt. 33) is **GRANTED**. The Clerk is directed to substitute the correct respondent—Dean Mason, Superintendent of Washington Corrections Center—in this matter. Should there be a need to substitute the correct respondent again in these proceedings, Respondent or the Interested Party Attorney General shall renew this Motion.

Dated this 13th day of July, 2023.

Grady J. Leupold United States Magistrate Judge